

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 18, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-15 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1-9 and 12-15 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 2 the Examiner objected to claims 2-8 and these claims have been amended. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Wang. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claims 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Wang and AutoCAD.

As discussed with the Examiner by telephone on or about August 17 and 20, 2007, and in a personal interview on September 11, 2007, Wang does not teach or suggest "a **three-dimensional** orientation indicator **widget positioned in** a three-dimensional scene and visually indicating an orientation of the scene, and said indicator comprising: view direction controls each indicating a direction of a corresponding view into the three-dimensional scene and causing a display view **orientation** of the three-dimensional scene to change to the corresponding view when selected" - claim 1 (emphasis added).

AutoCAD adds nothing to Wang with respect to this feature.

Claims 9 and 12-15, which have a different scope, also emphasize similar features.

On or about August 17 and 20, 2007, the Examiner noted US patent 7,119,819 to Robertson. As discussed with and recognized by the Examiner in the personal interview on September 11, 2007, Robertson does not teach or suggest "where the view controls rotate corresponding to the change in the display view orientation" - claim 1.

AutoCAD and Wang add nothing to Robertson with respect to this feature.

Claims 9 and 12-15, which have a different scope, also emphasize similar features.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 emphasizes "a central core control associated with a perspective view of the scene; and axial controls peripherally positioned with respect to the core control, aligned with the axial dimensions of the scene and associated with corresponding front, back, top, bottom, left side and right side views."

The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the present claims patentably distinguish over Wang, AutoCAD and Robertson, taken together or alone and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 18, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/  
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501